IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

Wayne Doyle,

Plaintiff.

Case No. 3:07-cv-003

-VS-

District Judge Thomas M. Rose

John Mc Conagha and the Clark County Library, et al.,

Magistrate Judge Michael Merz

Defendants.

-ADDENDUM-MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S APRIL 25,2007 RECONSIDERATION MOTION

<u>-MOTION-</u> COURT TO ASSIST PLAINTIFF DOYLE TO GET LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Plaintiff Wayne Doyle failed to mention the following reasons why this court

Should stay the proceedings while Plaintiff is seeking counsel:

- 1. During the year 2005, Plaintiff Wayne Doyle had (3) sisters pass on over to the other side of the river. Orgin January. One in March. One in June.
- 2. During the years 2005-2006, I took care of my mother who could not physically or mentally take care of herself.
- On January 23,2006, my Mother passed over to the other side of the river. 3.
- January of this year I had another sister pass to the other side of the river. 4.
- 5. During the past (3) years I have not been able to work a full time job.
- Currently I am working and plan on being able to pay a lawyer to represent me. 6.

RELIEF SOUGHT

Plaintiff Wayne Doyle would like for this court to (DIRECT) in finding legal representation to present pleadings to the clerk without Judge Merz withholding the pleading from the court Docket until he personally examines the pleadings. Fore the April 25, motion for reconsideration has not been docketed into the record as of April 27,2007. 9:00 am. Note. Wayne Doyle's case file has not been available for the public's viewing for 3-4 days at a time.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHER DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

-STAY THE PROCEEDINGS-

**This case file is not two years old **

-Question for Judge Mertz: What does "the events in suit happened more than two years ago" have to do with "Plaintiff has had time to employ counsel?

SERVICE

Mailed to Lois A Gruhin 21 East State Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 This 27th day of April, 2007.

THOUGHT TO CONSIDER

THE PHRASE "ABUSE OF DISCRETION" COONOTES MORE THAN ERROR OF LAW OR JUDGEMENT; IT IMPLIES THAT THE COURT'S ATTITUDE IS UNREASONABLE, ARBITRARY, OR UNCONSCIONABLE.